and the evil tendencies of man may have come about; but, in itself, it is incompetent to furnish any better reason why what we call good is preferable to what we call evil than we had before. Some day, I doubt not, we shall arrive at an understanding of the evolution of the æsthetic faculty; but all the understanding in the world will neither increase nor diminish the force of the intuition that this is beautiful and that is ugly." Such a declaration, coming from such a quarter, must be regarded as carrying considerable weight; yet it seems doubtful whether Professor Huxley has sufficiently considered the attempts that have been made by such writers as Mr. L. Stephen and Mr. S. Alexander to find a basis for ethics in the evolutionary process. One would have liked to see some more direct criticism of their efforts. One would have liked also to see some indication of the way in which Professor Huxley himself would establish the validity of moral distinctions. As it is, however, it is important to have this acknowledgment from so eminent an evolutionist, that the question of origin is not quite the same as that of validity. It is needless to say that the lecture is written in a highly vigorous, impressive, and interesting style.

<div align="right">J. S. MACKENZIE.</div>

ANTHROPOLOGICAL RELIGION. The Gifford Lectures delivered before the University of Glasgow in 1891. By F. Max Müller, K.M., Foreign Member of the French Institute. London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1892. Pp. xxvii, 464.

Following the broad lines sketched out in his Introductory Lecture of 1889, Professor Max Müller here treats the third distinct portion of his subject. In the first series, under the title "Natural Religion," certain more general considerations, relative to the nature of religion as a whole, were elucidated. Secondly, in "Physical Religion," such doctrines and beliefs as might be affiliated to external objects received attention. Here, on the contrary, as the title implies, a transition is effected to a sphere in which a distinctively religious content finds place. By contemplation of the real world, or by contact with certain of its objects, man may, by physical means, arrive at the belief in a Superior Being. But, on account of the limitations incident to the physical sphere, this Being, derived by a species of induction, remains foreign to human nature. The other-worldliness of deity is his chief characteristic in physical religion. God stands over against man just like a cabbage or a cliff. In contradistinction to this,

anthropological religion is constituted by man's effort to discover the infinite and divine within himself. "Otherwise anthropological religion has nothing to do with anthropology. It is called anthropological simply and solely in order to comprehend under that name all the attempts which have been made to discover something not merely human, then superhuman, then divine and immortal in man. The most interesting parts of this process are the beginning and the end, the first discovery of something different from the body, and the final identification of that something with the divine." The introductory matter is very extended and practically monopolizes the first six lectures. Thereafter, by way of animism, linguistic suggestions, folk-lore connected with death and the disposal of the dead, the author brings us, in the thirteenth and closing lecture, to the divine in the human. The second great article of faith is, "I believe in my own soul and in its divine worship."

From the foregoing analysis it will be apparent to all that those who, like the present writer, had the privilege of hearing the lectures, were charmed by the wealth of illustration at Professor Max Müller's command. But this very opulence has proved a snare. It may certainly have originated such fine passages as that in the fourth lecture headed, "I am that I am." Yet, on the whole, I believe it to be answerable for the very great defect, which, in my opinion, mars Professor Müller's entire scheme. He confines himself to the collection of interesting details; and this work he carries out in masterly fashion. But it is not natural theology. Moreover, when he strives to induce order in the chaos of facts, he adopts a division which, from the point of view of philosophy of religion at least, is wholly indefensible. "Physical" religion cannot be separated from "Anthropological," nor can either be sundered from "Natural" religion, except by false abstractions. And to premise that "Anthropological" religion occupies a sphere distinct from that of "Psychological" (the subject of the final course soon to be published) is the greatest abstraction of all.

R. M. WENLEY.

UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW.

TRUE MORALITY; OR, THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF NEO-MALTHUSIANISM. By J. R. Holmes, pp. 144 (Hanney, Wantage), 1892.

As forty pages of this little book are devoted to an illustrated price-list, necessarily inartistic, and most of the remainder to a